

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	. FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/831,629	08/17/2001	Rina Aharoni	AHARONI 5B	6949	
1444	7590 01/20/2004		EXAMINER		
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW			LUKTON, DAVID		
SUITE 300	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
WASHING	GTON, DC 20001-5303		1653	a:	
			DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004	1	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

, ,				,		
}.	Applic	cation No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Sum		31,629	AHARONI ET AL.			
Office Action Sun	- Aun	•	Art Unit			
T. 444 NO DATE - 64		Lukton	vith the correspondence address			
Period for Reply	s communication appears or	i the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address	·		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS (- Extensions of time may be available under after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing da - If the period for reply specified above is les - If NO period for reply is specified above, the - Failure to reply within the set or extended - Any reply received by the Office later than earned patent term adjustment. See 37 Ct Status	COMMUNICATION. the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In recte of this communication. se than thirty (30) days, a reply within the maximum statutory period will apply a period for reply will, by statute, cause the three months after the mailing date of the	no event, however, may a e statutory minimum of thi and will expire SIX (6) MO e application to become A	reply be timely filed inty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communic IBANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	cation.		
1) Responsive to communic	ation(s) filed on <u>03 March 20</u>	<u>003</u> .				
2a) This action is FINAL .	2b)⊠ This action i	s non-final.				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are pend 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allo 6) □ Claim(s) is/are reject 7) □ Claim(s) is/are object 8) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> are subject	is/are withdrawn from wed. ected. ected to.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is object	ed to by the Examiner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on		· ·				
	nat any objection to the drawing			0441)		
Replacement drawing sheet 11) The oath or declaration is	•		g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 ar	•	. Note the attache	d Office Action of John 1 10-152	۷.		
12) Acknowledgment is made		v under 35 H.S.C.	8 119(a)-(d) or (f)			
a) All b) Some * c) 1. Certified copies of the certified copies of the certified copies of the certification from the specification from the specification from the since a specific reference with a s	None of: the priority documents have the priority documents have the priority documents have ted copies of the priority doc te International Bureau (PCT Office action for a list of the of a claim for domestic priority tas included in the first sente foreign language provisional of a claim for domestic priority	been received. been received in a uments have been Rule 17.2(a)). certified copies no ty under 35 U.S.Cence of the specified al application has left under 35 U.S.C	Application No n received in this National Stage t received. S 119(e) (to a provisional appli cation or in an Application Data	ication) Sheet.		
Attachment(s)		_				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw Information Disclosure Statement(s) (ing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

A restriction is imposed, as set forth below. First, however, the following subgenera are defined:

G1: The polymer consists of three and only three amino acids selected from Lys/Arg, Glu/Asp, Ala/Gly and Tyr/Trp;

G2: The copolymer consists of four and only four amino acids as permitted by claim 1, i.e., the four amino acids are selected from the following ("D" or "L" isomers): KEAY, KDAY, KEGY, KEAW, KDGY, KDGW, KDAW, KEGW, REAY, RDAY, REGY, REAW, RDGY, RDAW, REGW;

G3: the copolymer comprises or consists essentially of any peptide that is encompassed by claim 1, with the proviso the G1 and G2 are excluded.

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. §121:

- 1. Claims 1 and 6-15, drawn to a composition, limited to G1.
- 2. Claims 1-5 and 15, drawn to a composition, limited to G2.
- 3. Claims 1-15, drawn to a composition, limited to G3
- 4. Claims 16 and 21-32, drawn to a method, limited to G1
- 5. Claims 17-20 and 30-33, drawn to a method, limited to G2
- 6. Claims 16-33, drawn to a method, limited to G3.

The claimed inventions are distinct.

In subgenus G1, the copolymer is limited to three amino acids, and in G2, to four amino acids. These are distinct from one another. In subgenus G3, there must be at least one additional amino acid, (e.g., C, F, H, I, M, P, S, T, V) or other non-amino acid substituent.

While no such copolymers (within "G3") are exemplified, they are nonetheless encompassed because of the terms "comprising" and "consisting essentially of".

Inventions {1-3} and {4-6} are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the pharmaceutical compositions could be used for *in vitro* assays, or for treating any of several inflammatory conditions. Nevertheless, in the event that any of Groups 1-3 is elected, and claims therein found allowable, the corresponding method-of-use claims will be rejoined therewith, provided also that the limitations of the allowed claims are incorporated into the method claims.

Applicant is advised that for the response to this requirement to be complete, an election of the invention to be examined must be indicated, even if the requirement is traversed (37 C.F.R. 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(h).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. When applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not

commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

In addition to the foregoing, applicants are required under 35 U.S.C. §121 to elect disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Regardless of which group is chosen for initial examination, election of each of the following species is required:

- (a) a specific copolymer, accompanied by a statement as to stereochemistry (i.e., "D" or "L") of each amino acid present in the copolymer and the composition;
- (b) a molecular weight of a copolymer that must be present in the composition (note that recitation of a range of 2000 to 40000 D is not a specific molecular weight);
- (c) a statement as to whether the electrical charge of the copolymer is positive, or the electrical charge of the copolymer is negative;

In the event that one of Groups 4-6 is elected, a second specie to be elected is a specific organ or tissue such as one of those recited in claim 33.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a generic claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are witten in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP 809.02(a).

Serial No. 09/831,629 Art Unit 1653

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentable distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lukton whose telephone number is 571-272-0952. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low, can be reached at 571-272-0951. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

DAVID LUITICH PATENT EXAMAGEN CROLD 1800

DAVID LUKTON PATENT EXAMPLER GROUP 1800